

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov;"Klasen, Matthew N." (b) (6)
Klasen, Matthew N." (b) (6) Boots, Michael J."
(b) (6) Nuzum, Robert S." (b) (6)
From: Letty_Belin@ios.doi.gov
Sent: Mon 11/16/2009 1:23:39 PM
Subject: Re: Outline to capture our workplan structure discussion

thanks Tom -- I agree with all of your points.

Letty Belin
Counselor to the Deputy Secretary
letty_belin@ios.doi.gov
202-208-6291

From: Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov
To: "Klasen, Matthew N." (b) (6)
Cc: David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov, letty_belin@ios.doi.gov, "Boots, Michael J." (b) (6)
Date: 11/13/2009 05:58 PM
Subject: Re: Outline to capture our workplan structure discussion

That outline looks correct to me.

Here are some specific and general comments that may be useful to the DC redrafter(s).

On the call, I heard of couple of things that we need to include:

- (1) Some kind of paragraph in the introduction about the intent to develop performance measures.
- (2) Working science into each of the three sections. I would actually recommend still putting some kind of a paragraph in the introduction about the commitment to science, then put the concrete examples in the body.
- (3) I must admit that I still am unclear on the Nawi proposal. A short summary of the "approach" in the three areas with exemplary projects, followed by a longer section and more projects in the body, seems redundant. I'm sure David will explain this to me at some point, but, given that I don't understand it right now, I'm not volunteering to write it.

Here are a couple of other nits that I noticed that we did not discuss on the call. You can fix them in this version or we'll do it later in the week.

- (1) The BOR piece on water supply included a number of ecosystem projects. Those should be moved to the ecosystem section. I'm including the San Joaquin Restoration Project on page 6, the entire discussion of environmental restoration on page 7, and possibly the BDCP discussion on page 7. On that last one, I'm not sure where you want to put BDCP. By nomenclature, it's an ecosystem project, but it is also a water supply project. Your call.

(2) I would recommend adding a "Drinking Water Section" to the sustainable water supply discussion. It will be short.

(3) Somehow, we managed to miss discussing drainage issues in the San Joaquin. It's a \$500 million settlement (or more) and probably needs to be highlighted as a priority, at least for Congress since they need to approve the funding.

That;'s it for now. Have a good weekend!

From: "Klasen, Matthew N." <Matthew_N_Klasen@ceq.eop.gov>
To: <letty_belin@ios.doi.gov>, <David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov>, Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Boots, Michael J." (b) (6) "Nuzum, Robert S."
(b) (6)
Date: 11/13/2009 02:29 PM
Subject: Outline to capture our workplan structure discussion

Letty, Tom, and David:

Please see the attached outline, which represents where I think we came to on the organization of each section of the work plan. Please let us know if this seems like an accurate representation of what we discussed.

If so, we'll take an initial crack at reorganizing the three sections of the document to match this model. We anticipate that there are quite a few holes in the document once we reorganize (on either the policy side, on-the-ground activities side, or the future priorities side) that we'll leave blank for now, but that we'd appreciate your attention either later this weekend or early next week.

Thanks again for all your help on this. We actually had the thought yesterday that we've made good progress given that we have a full month left, and hopefully we can continue the momentum next week.

Enjoy the weekend!

Best,
Matt

Matt Klasen
White House Council on Environmental Quality
734 Jackson Place NW
Washington DC 20503
(b) (6)

[attachment "2009-11-13 Work Plan Outline.doc" deleted by Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US]